



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/105,528	06/26/1998	NICHOLAS JOLYAN STANIFORT KNOWLES	CR9-98-062	5684

25259 7590 06/18/2003

IBM CORPORATION
3039 CORNWALLIS RD.
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195
REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

LE, UYEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003

22

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/105,528

Applicant(s)

KNOWLES, NICHOLAS JOLYAN
STANIFORT

Examiner

Uyen T Le

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) *Me*
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 22.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration and arguments filed on April 4, 2003 seem to emphasize the single issue that Siefert does not have an "object model". The examiner attempted to contact applicant's representative Gregory Doudnifoff on May 21 2003 to obtain further clarification on the claimed object model. Applicant's representative called back on May 27, 2003 but took note of the questions and asked for time to review the case before further discussion. No response from applicant's representative has been received, thus the examiner is interpreting the broadly claimed "object model" in light of the specification.

Applicant alleges that Siefert does not disclose the use of an object model, that Siefert does not disclose a technique for displaying or working with relationships within an object model. In response, an object model as described in the specification at page 2, second paragraph, is a software application. The CAD program in Siefert is a software application, thus is clearly an object model.

Regarding claim 1:

Applicant alleges that there is no discussion in Siefert that the drop-down menu shows an object model. In response, again in light of the specification at page 2, the whole CAD application of Siefert is an object model, thus the drop down menu which shows the features of the CAD program clearly shows the object model;

Applicant alleges that the use of the menus in Siefert does not teach, suggest or disclose an object model or a technique for navigating an object model. In response, the

Art Unit: 2171

menus in Siefert clearly allow navigation of the CAD program which is clearly an object model;

Applicant alleges that the icons of FILE, DRAW, EDIT, COPY do not represent an object model. In response, the CAD program in Siefert is an object model in light of the specification at page 2, thus the icons clearly represent the object model;

Applicant alleges that the elements of POINT, LINE, CIRCLE, ELLIPSE, BOX TEXT “have nothing to do with an object model, much less relationships within an object model”. In response, claim 1 merely requires “a sub-process for retrieving and displaying relationship information from said model when said selected element is a component of said model”. The CAD program of Siefert is clearly an object model in light of the specification at page 2, thus when the user selects DRAW which is an element of the object model, the POINT, LINE, CIRCLE, ELLIPSE, BOX, TEXT are displayed which clearly represent retrieved relationship information from said model;

Applicant alleges that there is no description or discussion of a user selecting a relationship from displayed relationship information. In response, again the CAD program in Siefert in light of the specification at page 2 is an object model. The claimed “sub-process for enabling said user to select one or more relationships from said displayed relationship information” is met when the user selects from POINT, LINE, CIRCLE, ELLIPSE, BOX, TEXT.

Regarding claim 4, applicant alleges that the selected options from Siefert are not based on relationships within an object model. In response, claim 4 merely requires “a list of actions tailored to said selected one or more relationships”. The claimed object

Art Unit: 2171

model is met by the CAD program in Siefert, the selected element is met when the user selects DRAW. The selected relationship is met when the user selects CIRCLE. Thus the selectable options of CENTER , RADIUS and DIAMETER in Siefert clearly are tailored to the selected relationship CIRCLE.

Regarding claim 6, applicant alleges that there is no discussion of predefined filters or the use of such filters in Siefert. In response, claim 6 merely requires "said action list is filtered before being presented to said user, using one or more predefined filters". Since only CENTER, RADIUS and DIAMETER are presented upon the user selecting CIRCLE, clearly the action list has been "filtered, using one or more predefined filters" as claimed.

Applicant presents no further arguments except that claims 8 and 15, 11 and 18, 13 and 20 were rejected for the same rational as claims 1, 4 and 6 respectively, thus it follows that those claims also distinguish over Siefert.

Therefore, for all the reasons stated above, rejection to all claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-20 is maintained using Siefert of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Siefert et al (US 5,726,688) of record.

Regarding claim 1, the claimed computer readable code for implementing a visually-oriented technique for navigating an object model is met when Siefert shows the drop-down menu of the CAD program in Figures 1-2. The claimed sub process for displaying a browser merely reads on the fact that the system of Siefert includes user interfaces used to file, draw, edit and copy. The claimed sub process for retrieving and displaying a set of elements in said browser, said elements representing said object model is met when the system displays the icons of FILE, DRAW, EDIT, COPY. The claimed sub process for enabling a user to select one of said elements is clearly present for the user to select the icons shown in Figure 2. The claimed sub process for retrieving and displaying relationship information from said model when said selected element is a component of said model is met when Siefert shows POINT, LINE, CIRCLE, ELLIPSE, BOX, TEXT. The claimed sub process for enabling said user to select one or more relationships from said displayed relationship information has to be present for the user of the system of Siefert to select from POINT, LINE, CIRCLE, ELLIPSE, BOX, TEXT (see Figure 2).

Regarding claim 3, the claimed action list is met by the options of CENTER & RADIUS, TWO POINTS, DIAMETER, THREE POINTS (see Figure 2).

Regarding claim 4, clearly the action list includes actions tailored to the selected relationship since the action of CENTER & RADIUS is tailored to CIRCLE.

Regarding claim 5, the claimed selected element is met by the fact that the user selects DRAW. The claimed action list of actions tailored to said selected element when said element is a component merely reads on the options to draw a POINT, a LINE, a CIRCLE, an ELLIPSE, a BOX or TEXT upon the user selecting DRAW.

Regarding claim 6, Siefert discloses that the action list is filtered before being presented to said user, using one or more predefined filters when Siefert shows the action list of CENTER & RADIUS, DIAMETER filtered to drawing a CIRCLE (see Figure 2).

Regarding claim 7, Siefert shows a conventional browser (see Figures 1-2).

Claims 8, 14 correspond respectively to a system for the computer program product of claims 1, 7, therefore are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 1, 7 above.

Claim 15 corresponds to a method for the computer program product of claim 1, therefore is rejected for the same reasons stated in claim 1 above.

Claims 10-13, 17-20 correspond respectively to a system and method for the computer program product of claims 3-6, therefore are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 3-6 above.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gedye et al "Browsing the chip design database", IEEE 1988, pages 269-274.

Art Unit: 2171

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen T Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Uyen Le
June 16, 2003